

January 21, 1980

**SECTION:** Pro and Con; Pg. 27

**LENGTH:** 890 words

**HEADLINE:** Should U.S. Boycott **Olympics?**;  
YES -- "Soviet aggression is a violation of the basic precepts of the Olympics"

**BYLINE:** Interview With Representative Edward J. Derwinski; Republican Of Illinois

**BODY:**

Q. Representative Derwinski, why do you favor an American boycott of the 1980 Summer **Olympic** Games in Moscow?

A. The latest reason is the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan. It is a flagrant violation of the basic precepts of the **Olympics**, which favor peaceful competition among the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union has been in violation of many international standards in its diplomatic, military, economic activities for years, and there has been a tolerance in the world about it. But this naked aggression may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

On top of the Afghanistan invasion, you have to look at the Soviets' propaganda role against the U.S. in Iran and throughout the Middle East, the buildup of Soviet military forces and the threat this poses to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Soviet military buildup in the islands north of Japan. You get a picture of an aggressive, belligerent power. In these circumstances, I don't think the Soviet Union is the proper host for the Olympics.

Q. Do you believe Soviet conduct would really be influenced by a U.S. boycott?

A. The Soviets have grandiose plans for maximum propaganda use of the Olympics. Surely the Soviet Union expects that television coverage will show the good side of life in the Soviet Union. The Soviets are taking elaborate pains to accommodate the spectators who will come to Moscow for the games. And just like Hitler in 1936, they are building up their own athletes to win medals and score maximum propaganda impact.

The fact is that in this age of mass communications, propaganda is the key to many of the actions that governments take. So, if you take away the Soviets' propaganda card, you've done great damage to them.

Q. Do you think the U.S. made a mistake when it participated in the 1936 Olympics in Nazi Germany?

A. Hindsight is always better than foresight. The answer, I think, would be mixed. It would have been a mistake had not Jesse Owens done surprisingly well.

But there's another aspect this time. Even if there weren't an Afghanistan crisis, I think one could make a very good case against Soviet sponsorship based on their noncompliance with Olympic rules limiting competition to non-professionals.

Unlike the athletes sent to the Olympics by most countries of the Western World, Soviet athletes are not amateurs. They're either given career positions in the military or they are, in effect, career competitors. This includes their hockey team. It includes their track-and-field team. It includes their specialized athletic performers. There's no doubt that by a strict interpretation of the rule, they'd have to be considered professionals.

Q. Many people think the Olympics ought to be kept out of politics in every way --

A. I agree. But that's where we have a failing. We keep politics out of the Olympics. They don't. There's dual standard, and we're on the short end of it. The battle lines should have been drawn a long time ago. They were not. But at this point, given the worldwide reaction to their Afghanistan invasion, we have an issue we can use against the

Soviets.

Q. Are there other steps that might be more effective than boycotting the Olympics in exerting pressure on the Russians?

A. Well, if the United Nations could impose proper sanctions against the Soviet Union, that would make the Olympic card less necessary. But the Russians sit there with a veto power that effectively neutralizes the U.N. The Allies of the U.S. are perfectly willing to stand with us when NATO is threatened, but they're not going to do anything to help us develop a more effective front in Asia.

Take a look at the other practicalities of the case, and you see that there isn't any immediate and direct major countermove we can make against the Soviets.

Q. What about all of the American athletes who have trained so long and so hard? They are looking forward to the Moscow games --

A. That would be one of the hardest parts of this action. But if our government reached a decision -- in concert with the U.S. Olympic Committee and others, of course -- to institute a boycott of the Olympics, then U.S. public opinion, and therefore the cooperation of our athletes, would obviously follow.

Q. Do you see any possibility of organizing some kind of counter competition to the games somewhere else?

A. No, not unless it were something dramatic, such as the government of Greece offering to stage a symbolic Olympic event in the land that fathered the Olympic spectacle.

Q. Have you found many in Congress who feel as you do?

A. Well, I think in general we all recognize, and I certainly do, that under our system the U.S. Olympic Committee is independent.

Q. Congress couldn't stop U.S. participation even if it wanted to?

A. Not really. It is up to the Olympic Committee to make the decision.

The Olympic Committee should have been much more militant all along in pointing out the standards the Russians apply or do not apply, and the type of athletic structure that exists in the Soviet Union.

The Olympic Committee should be much more energetic in defending the rights of real amateurs against what I consider the professionals of the Soviet Union, East Germany and a few of the other bloc countries.

**January 21, 1980**

**SECTION:** Pro and Con; Pg. 27

**LENGTH:** 940 words

**HEADLINE:** Should U.S. Boycott **Olympics?**;  
NO -- "The games should be kept free of politics as much as possible"

**BYLINE:** Interview With Robert J. Kane; President of the U.S. Olympic Committee

**BODY:**

Q. Mr. Kane, why do you believe it would be a mistake for the U.S. to boycott the **Olympic** Games?

A. I don't favor the concept of a boycott at all in the **Olympic** Games. The **Olympic** Games should be kept free of politics as much as possible, and it's up to those within the movement to protect it from politics. A boycott is an internal device which must be necessarily instituted by the members themselves.

And I don't think it would be conducive to the continuance of the games if boycotts became common practice. There are always differences between nations, and if there were a boycott every time this happened, there would never be Olympic Games.

Q. Do you think that a boycott would have any effect on the Russians' international behavior if it were attempted?

A. I doubt it very much. It would seem to be a minimal kind of response, and I think that there are other means that could be far more discouraging to the Soviets and their desires. It seems to me that a boycott would not do the job its advocates would like to have done.

Q. How about the view of the those who say that a boycott would be one way of demonstrating to the Soviets that actions such as the invasion of Afghanistan are incompatible with detente with the U.S.?

A. I can see why this could be thought of as such a demonstration. But the Olympic Games don't belong to the Soviet Union. They belong to the International Olympic Committee. Moscow is just the site of the games for 1980.

Q. Are the Soviets already making propaganda use -- in other words, political use -- of sponsorship of the games?

A. I wouldn't doubt that. Any nation where the games are held probably uses them for propaganda purposes. That is not worrisome unless it's a pernicious use.

Q. Do you expect it to become pernicious?

A. No, I don't.

Q. Do you have adequate assurances from Moscow on that score?

A. Yes. We do have adequate assurances. But that wouldn't convince me as much as believing that the Soviets would like to look good in the eyes of the world when the focus of the world is on them via television cameras.

Q. Haven't the Olympics already been politicized in many cases? In 1976, for example, several African countries boycotted the Montreal games, and Canada, in effect, barred Taiwan --

A. Yes. It's quite true that politics has been a part of the games. In fact, anything as global as the Olympic Games would have great trouble steering clear of politics. But for the most part, politics has been inflicted on the games by outside forces, as it was in the Montreal games or the Arab terrorist attack on Israeli athletes at the Munich games.

Q. Who could actually initiate an American boycott? Could Congress do it?

A. I would think that Congress could ask the United States Olympic Committee to stay out of the games.

Q. But would the committee be bound to obey?

A. No, it would not be bound to obey, because the U.S. Olympic Committee is a private organization. But we would, of course, be receptive to any admonition from our government.

Q. Under what circumstances would you agree to a boycott?

A. If there's serious problem at the site of the games, then I believe that the United States ought to consider pulling out of the games for that year. In other words, if the situation worsens in the Persian Gulf, and if Moscow becomes a dangerous place and lives could conceivably be placed in jeopardy, then I think that either the International Olympic Committee ought to call off the games or the United States, for the protection of its own athletes, should consider staying out of the games for that year. That's far different thing from a boycott. That would be a matter of security, not politics.

Q. The U.S. didn't boycott the games in Nazi Germany in 1936. Do you think that was a mistake?

A. It might seem as though we didn't handle that very well. But we came out not only looking good but making the Nazis look bad. Jesse Owens and six other black American athletes won more medals in track and field than the whole German Olympic team.

Q. Could a U.S. boycott of the Moscow games invite counteraction by other countries?

A. That's right, because if we were to stay out of the Moscow games because we disagreed with what the Soviets did in Afghanistan, there could be people who disagree with what we did to, say, Taiwan, and stay out of the winter games in Lake Placid next month or the summer games in Los Angeles in 1984. It becomes a never-ending thing when we use the Olympics as a tool on political issues.

Q. What about the effect it would have on U.S. athletes if they were told they couldn't go to Moscow? Wouldn't that be serious?

A. It certainly would, because an athlete usually has only one chance to take part in the Olympic Games. And many of them have trained all their young lives to get there, and a boycott would snatch away their one opportunity.

Q. When the International Olympic Committee meets in Lake Placid on the 10th of February, do you expect that it will consider this question of boycott?

A. I'm sure that they will discuss it, because it's a very serious consideration for them. The IOC is deeply concerned that there might be some nations that would boycott the games. There would be at least three alternatives: If the situation does not worsen, the games could go on as planned. If the situation worsens, the games could be canceled or they could be awarded to another site in another country. However, it's so late now that a change in site would not be possible until 1981.

**January 28, 1980**

**SECTION:** Currents in the News; Pg. 7

**LENGTH:** 580 words

**HEADLINE:** Shaping Up: An **Olympics** Without U.S.

**BODY:**

Unless Russia pulls its troops out of Afghanistan soon, you probably can count the United States out of the Moscow **Olympic** Games next summer.

White House Press Secretary Jody Powell reported on January 18 that President Carter is convinced the U.S. should not participate "while Soviet troops are engaged in a very brutal repression of the people of Afghanistan." So prospects are these --

Attempts will be made to move the summer games out of Moscow.

If the efforts fail -- as seems certain -- the U.S. will boycott the games.

If enough nations follow the American lead, there may be Olympic-Type games held in some other country as a rival to the Moscow show -- with the U.S. footing much of the costs.

This outlook is the result of a rising tide of anti-Soviet anger that has swept across the U.S. and other non-Communist countries in recent weeks.

An Olympic boycott was urged as a way not only to demonstrate disapproval of Soviet aggression but also to inflict a painful punishment.

Diplomats said that Moscow is counting heavily on the games as propaganda -- an attempt to show its own people and other nations that its Communist regime enjoys worldwide friendship and respect. Loss of the games, besides hurting Soviet prestige, would cost Moscow heavily in television and tourist revenue.

Most Americans seemed to be backing President Carter in his call for action. Hundreds of telephone calls and more than 1,000 letters and telegrams poured into the White House. Over 80 percent of the callers and 70 percent of the wires and letters supported a boycott or a transfer of the Olympics. So have most editorials and letters in U.S. newspapers. Public-opinion polls ran heavily in the same direction.

Among resolutions introduced in Congress opposing U.S. participation at Moscow was a proposal by Representative Robert Bauman (R-Md.) calling for a "Free World Olympics" as an alternative to the Russian games.

This would require participation by several countries, and so far only the British and Canadian governments have expressed support for moving the games. Finding a city with adequate facilities would be a problem. Former Olympic sites such as Montreal and Mexico City have been mentioned. Another suggestion: Delay the Olympics until some city is ready to handle them.

But the most likely options, as one Olympic official put it, are "Moscow or nothing." Only the International Olympic Committee can cancel, transfer or postpone the Olympics, and it is adamantly opposed to any such action.

An American boycott would require action by the U.S. Olympic Committee, whose leaders oppose the idea. But members conceded that it would be difficult to resist if both Congress and the Carter administration came down strongly against going to Moscow.

Another point: The U.S. is staging the Winter Olympic Games at Lake Placid, N.Y., this February, and the summer

games of 1984 are set for Los Angeles. An American boycott of Moscow could provoke counter boycotts of the games in this country.

American athletes have trained hard for years for a chance at a 1980 Olympic title, and many were distressed over the boycott threat. But former U.S. Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, noting that American farmers lost a big market when Carter canceled grain sales to Russia, asked: "If the farmers are willing to make sacrifices, why not athletes? And why not the rest of us?"

“Inside the Big Red Machine” *Time* June 23, 1980, 82.

Monday, Jun. 23, 1980

## Sport: Inside the Big Red Machine

An athletic program for everyone yields Olympic gold

In a Leningrad gym, a class of ten-year-old schoolgirls begins one of its twice-weekly sessions by executing handstands on the parallel bars. In Moscow's Central Army Sports Club, teams of soldiers exchange their combat boots for skates; a hockey puck is soon cracking like gunfire against the wooden boards. Near by, in Luzhniki Park, a group of middle-aged citizens sets out on a supervised 10-km walk, picking berries along the way.

A few vignettes from everyday sporting life in the Soviet Union, where fitness is virtually a state religion and millions of citizens take part in an elaborate system of athletic instruction and awards. Designed for the masses, the Soviet sports machine has nonetheless produced an athletic elite of awesome proportions, with all the international political benefits that implies. Just as do many other countries, the U.S.S.R. views sport as a useful political weapon. Since participating in its first modern Olympiad in 1952 in Helsinki, the Soviet Union has won 685 medals in the Summer Games—more than any other nation during those years (the U.S., in second place, has collected 603). The Kremlin considered this year's Games in Moscow—the first ever held in a Communist nation—not only as another quadrennial chance to demonstrate Soviet athletic prowess, but also as the best possible way to show off its society to the rest of the world.

The Soviet sports program, supervised by the Physical Culture and Sports Committee of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, is organized down to the level of nursery school and factory. At the top are 39 "voluntary sports societies" run by regional labor unions. Each has its own teams, facilities, and badges; Spartak, for example, has 4 million members, mostly white collar workers, each of whom pays 30 kopecks (45¢) annual dues.

Then come the nearly 1.5 million sports clubs, ranging from the tiny Kolos of the Kalinin collective farm near Pinsk in Belorussia to the nationwide Central Army Club, which draws its members from the armed services. According to official figures, enrollment in the societies and the sports clubs totals 57 million—one-fifth of the nation's population.

To encourage mass participation, Moscow pushes a set of nationwide physical tests for citizens aged ten to 60 called G.T.O. (Gotov k Trudu i Oborone, or Prepared for Work and Defense). To earn a gold badge in the Strength and Courage (ages 16 to 18) category, for instance, a citizen must be able to do twelve chin-ups and toss a grenade 40 meters, among other feats. In 1976, the last year for which figures are available, 20.5 million Soviets of all ages won silver and gold badges.

Starting at age seven, school children must take part in two 45-minute physical education classes weekly. By age ten or eleven, those who show promise attend one of 5,000 "junior sports schools" operated after regular classroom hours. One result of this early introduction to sport and fitness is the development of an enthusiasm for athletics that encompasses the whole society.

The most skilled young Soviet athletes graduate to one of the country's 600 Olympic reserve schools, located in the larger cities. The schools offer complete academic programs as well as athletic training, and their yearly graduating classes form the pool from which members are selected for national and individual republic squads in such sports as basketball and volleyball. Top athletes may also be drafted by the army specifically to play on the service's various teams.

Through this gleaning process the Soviet Union eventually selects its Olympic athletes. The best in team sports are selected through regional and national championships, while the finest in individual sports are determined in the quadrennial Spartakiad, a sort of dress-rehearsal Olympics held in Moscow the summer before the Games. In 1979, 90 million Soviet athletes tried out in local and regional contests, and 10,000 eventually took part in Spartakiad.

The best Soviet athletes win more than just medals. An Olympic-caliber competitor is a kind of professional amateur, with a salary paid by the state and a standard of living roughly equivalent to that of a successful factory manager. Vladimir Yashchenko, 21, a world-class high jumper busily training for the Olympics, receives a stipend of \$400 from the government. Irina Rodnina, 30, and Alexander Zaitsev, 28, the 1980 winter Olympic champion figure-skating pair, live in a two-bedroom apartment in downtown Moscow, a privilege seldom granted to a couple so young. Once their playing days are over, many Olympic athletes can look forward to careers as coaches and sport administrators.

Soviet authorities deny that their athletes use steroids, chemicals that promote muscle development but are outlawed in international competition. A few athletes have defected to the West with tales of widespread steroid use, but such charges are difficult to prove. Still the Soviet athletic establishment is under intense pressure to succeed, and athletes are sometimes asked to take up unpopular sports. Several years ago, the Sports Committee decided that Olympic gold could be mined from handball—a sport not seriously pursued in the Soviet Union. Word went out to the local sports schools to set up crash training programs for handbolists. "We are proud of such 'interference,' " said Sergei Pavlov, Minister of Sports. At the first Olympiad after that decision, in Montreal in 1976, Soviet players entered both the men's and women's handball matches and walked away with gold medals.



“Olympics: To GO or Not to Go” *Time* Jan. 28, 1980, 15.

Monday, Jan. 28, 1980

## Nation: Olympics: To Go or Not to Go (Part 1)

The U.S. weighs hitting Moscow where it would really hurt

In Moscow last week, truck after truck rolled to a stop outside the new press building near the Foreign Ministry, and fur-hatted workers unloaded crates of telephone and telex equipment. A mile north of the Kremlin, electricians toiled in the Olimpiisky Sports Center, which will be the largest covered stadium in Europe. Near by, other workers rushed to finish a huge swimming arena. In classrooms and auditoriums all over Moscow, some 200,000 prospective tour guides, waiters and other staffers continued learning foreign languages and the foibles of the 300,000 tourists who are expected at this summer's Olympic Games.

Thus, as far as Soviet officials were concerned, the Games were still on. But around the world there was a growing debate among diplomats, Olympic officials, champion athletes, politicians and sports fans over the Carter Administration's proposal that the Games be moved to another country, postponed or boycotted to protest the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Soviets reacted with anger. Said one editor about Carter: "He is going too far. This has nothing to do with Afghanistan. It is America's pure anti-Sovietism coming out again."

The fact is that there is probably no single action short of war that would punish Moscow more than to have the Olympics taken away or spoiled. As the first Communist country to play host to the modern Games in their 84-year history, the U.S.S.R. is determined to turn them into a model show. Over the past three years, the Soviets have spent, by their official figures, \$375 million in preparation for the Olympics, including the construction of 99 arenas, dormitories and other buildings. The Moscow Olympics are meant to be a monument to the Soviets' self-esteem, an extravaganza of self-congratulation that in a way betrays their profound insecurities. With so tempting a target, the Carter Administration last week was doing some purposeful sighting. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance announced a mid-February deadline for a Soviet pull-out from Afghanistan if the Games are to on as scheduled. Appearing on NBC'S Meet the Press, the President said that he had asked the U.S. Olympic Committee to Boycott the summer Games or move the Olympics to another city unless the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan by the February deadline. Said Carter: "Neither [ nor the American people will support sending the American team to Moscow while Soviet troops are in Afghanistan."

Only the International Olympic Committee can make the decision to move the Games. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who at the President's behest ounded out NATO members about shifting the Games, found them cool to the idea. Said French Minister of Youth and

Sports Jean-Pierre Soisson: "The Olympics are a sporting event, not a political affair." That, of course, is not true. The Olympics long ago became politicized, with authoritarian societies like Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union sparing no effort to train their athletes—all in the hopes of piling up gold medals as proof of the superiority of their political systems.

The only exception in Europe was Great Britain, where Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, appearing before the House of Commons, endorsed a shift of the Games. More than 100 members of Parliament signed motions urging the I.O.C. to move the Olympiad.

For its part, the I.O.C. is adamantly opposed to moving the Games. "It's Moscow or nowhere," said Lord Killanin, an Irish peer who has served as president of the I.O.C. since 1972. Killanin argued that it would be "virtually physically impossible" to shift the Games to another site, and that in any case the I.O.C. is obligated to fulfill its 1974 contract with the Soviet Union for the Moscow Games. U.S. officials nonetheless plan to ask the I.O.C. to take up the question of moving the Summer Games at its next

scheduled meeting, at Lake Placid, N.Y., early next month. But the request will almost certainly be turned down. Said a top I.O.C. official: "Those who believe that there will be no Moscow Games are the victims of wishful thinking. So far, all our national committees are against [any change]."

As an alternative, Christopher talked with NATO members about boycotting the Moscow Games. To muster support for a boycott, U.S. officials have suggested holding an alternate set of games, a sort of "Free World Olympics" in which nations boycotting the Moscow Games would compete. This would enable athletes from the U.S. and other nations who have been training for years to take part in an international contest, though obviously not one carrying the historic prestige of an Olympiad.

The boycott idea proved unpopular with most governments. The Netherlands, however, has stopped funding its Olympic teams, and Canada has expressed strong interest in a boycott.

On Sunday Carter said that he opposed U.S. participation in the Games "regardless of what other nations do." In theory, an American boycott decision would rest with the U.S. Olympic Committee. But the President's call for a withdrawal, which will probably be backed by Congress, will be difficult for the U.S.O.C. to reject. Its leaders are naturally upset at such a prospect. Said Robert Kane, 67, president of the U.S.O.C. since 1977: "I do not favor the concept of a boycott at all. The Games do not belong to the Soviet Union. They belong to the International Olympic Committee. To boycott the Games would be to show disloyalty to the organization to which we belong and to the Olympics." Moreover, said Kane, "a unilateral boycott would not be very effective." Not, perhaps, in halting the Games, but certainly in robbing the medals of much of their validity and prestige in sports where the U.S. would have been strong.

Last week Kane met with Vance and White House aides in Washington and repeated the U.S.O.C.'s strong opposition to a boycott. If the President did request one, Kane announced later, the U.S.O.C. would poll prospective team members before making a decision. Many champion athletes in the U.S. oppose a boycott. Said Al Feuerbach, 32, of San Jose, Calif., a shot putter who finished fourth in the 1976 Olympics: "I am 100% opposed to any pullout, for any reason. We make the sacrifice, we pay our own way, we're not connected to the Government. It's not their life dream that's being tampered with." Added Mark Belger, 23, who specializes in the 800-meter run: "We are being exploited to the fullest extent. Exploitation is taking away the right to run in the Olympics after working with that objective in mind for years." Agreed a former Olympic star, Bob Mathias, 49, of Colorado Springs, Colo., who won gold medals in the decathlon in 1948 and 1952: "Our people want to go to Moscow to beat the hell out of those guys and tell them face to face what's wrong with them."

“Olympics: To GO or Not to Go” *Time* Jan. 28, 1980, 15.

Monday, Jan. 28, 1980

## Nation: Olympics: To Go or Not to Go (Part 2)

But many other athletes would reluctantly boycott Moscow if asked to do so by the President. Said Craig Masback, 24, of White Plains, N.Y., one of the world's fastest milers: "As an athlete, I am very frustrated and disappointed. But I am also well aware of what an important political tool the Olympic Games represent, not only to the Soviet Union but to the entire Eastern bloc. Our boycotting the Games would be both valid and effective."

Dwight Stones, 26, a high jumper from Long Beach, Calif., who won bronze medals at both the 1972 and 1976 Games, thinks the U.S. should take more immediate action. Said he: "Why not bar the Soviet Union from coming here for the Winter Games?" Said Bill Toomey, 41, who won a gold medal in the decathlon in the 1968 Games: "We would be naive to place track and field ahead of world events."

Sports cannot live outside reality." Last week the Muhammad Ali Amateur Sports Club in Santa Monica, Calif., decided not to wait for the White House and announced its own boycott. The group, consisting of 32 athletes, agreed to the move after listening to an emotional speech by Ali. At least half a dozen club members—including Sprinter Houston McTear and Hurdler Greg Foster—were considered top Olympic contenders.

An American boycott of the Moscow Games would mean millions of dollars in losses for dozens of U.S. companies. NBC, for example, has paid the Soviets \$87 million for the television rights and plans to broadcast more than 150 hours of the Games this summer. If the U.S. withdraws, NBC has decided not to cover the Games at all. Though the network would recover almost all of the fee from its insurance company, it would lose expected advertising revenues, as well as its best chance of getting out of last place in the network ratings.

Merchandising rights for the 1980 Olympics in the Western Hemisphere are owned by Stanford Blum, president of Image Factory Sports, Inc., in Los Angeles. He has sold licenses to 58 companies to market Olympic trinkets, ranging from stuffed Misha bears (the official symbol of the Games) to pajamas and key chains. Because of the possible U.S. boycott, many retail stores have stopped ordering the souvenirs, and production has halted on some items. For example, US Americans, a firm based in Los Angeles, is stuck with an order of 15.5 million plain drinking glasses; until the boycott issue is resolved, the company does not dare follow through on plans to imprint the Moscow Games insignia on them. Grouched Blum: "The sales being blown away are between \$50 million and \$100 million. Premium promotions are hurting because companies don't want to be identified with things that have 'Moscow' written on them." Whatever happens, Blum will not look to Moscow for a refund. Said he, with a shrug: "The Soviets will simply say, 'It isn't our fault.' "

About 11,000 Americans who have paid deposits for trips to the Moscow Games are no doubt worrying about refunds in the event of a U.S. boycott. All travel arrangements are being handled by the Russian Travel Bureau—Olympic Travel, a U.S.-owned firm based in New York City. According to its president, E. Wallace Lawrence, some of the deposit money has already been sent on to the Soviet Union. If the U.S. withdraws from the Games and tourists cancel their reservations, Lawrence will attempt to negotiate reimbursements with Moscow; in any case, he promises to refund any funds still in the U.S.

The Kremlin is counting on the I.O.C. to hold firm and keep the Games in Moscow. Soviet officials argue that, since the U.S.S.R. has fulfilled its agreement with the I.O.C., there is no reason for moving the Games elsewhere. The Kremlin expects some athletes to withdraw, but as individuals and not as entire national teams. If nations do boycott the Games, Moscow is determined

to go on with the Olympiad. Four years later, however, it might pay back the U.S. by boycotting the Summer Games scheduled for Los Angeles.

If so, the Olympic movement might be mortally wounded. Said Kane: "There would no longer be Olympic Games. They would not be a global enterprise any more." On the other hand, the threat of boycott revived an old suggestion: that the Games be permanently located in a small country, thus making them less vulnerable to the pressures of high-powered international politics. President Carter favors this step. He believes that the most logical site would be Greece, where the Olympic torch first flickered in 776 B.C.

“Resounding Chorus of Maybes” *Time* March 31, 1980, 68.

Monday, Mar. 31, 1980

## Sport: A Resounding Chorus of Maybes (Part 1)

Support for boycotting the Moscow Olympics is slow to gather

With less than four months to go before the Moscow Olympics, just about the only people sweating harder than would-be Olympic athletes are the American officials trying to keep them from going. Last week the U.S. pressed its boycott campaign while plans for a counter-Olympics inched along and undecided nations continued to pass the baton. Among the week's setbacks, standoffs and small triumphs:

> In Washington, about 100 athletes, coaches, trainers and sports officials invited to the White House to discuss the boycott greeted President Carter with stony silence as he entered the East Room. In his 20-minute appeal, Carter said he understood their disappointment, but asserted that no matter what other athletes attend the Moscow Olympics, "ours will not go . . . the decision has been made." He hoped that alternate games would compensate, and even promised special recognition for anyone who attended. But in an informal poll afterward, only 29 supported the U.S. position.

> In Geneva, the U.S., U.K. and Australia invited 25 nations to a two-day meeting to hear White House Olympic Coordinator Lloyd Cutler spell out the U.S. position. Yet only nine of the countries invited sent delegates, and most of those who showed up listened coolly. Even staunchly pro-boycott Britain indicated that a timely Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan would "change everything."

> In London, the House of Commons endorsed a boycott, raising the pressure on the British Olympic Association to do so when the group makes its decision this week. Yet Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's tactics—like her threat to deny paid leave to competitors holding government jobs—angered athletes. At last count, 78 of Britain's 108 Olympic athletes said they still plan to attend.

> In West Germany, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt denounced the U.S.S.R.'s continued occupation of Afghanistan but stopped short of endorsing a boycott. A top French leader said privately, however, that if West Germany stays home, France will too.

U.S. officials insist that in the next two months as many as 50 of the 142 countries invited to Moscow will decide not to go; so far only 25 nations have endorsed the boycott. Much depends on how fast the boycotters can organize their alternate games, which Cutler calls the "WorldClass International Sports Festival." He envisions a series of events next August and September in a number of locales around the world. Funding for the games, however, will be difficult to obtain. Cutler claims that revenues from TV coverage could help, but executives at NBC and ABC decline to say if they would bid on coverage, and CBS, like the undecided nations, is "awaiting developments."

What next? Some delegates to last week's Geneva meeting agreed to hit the road in groups to convince other countries—and their own athletes—of the need for an Olympic boycott. At this rate, however, they might still be out hustling support while everybody else is in Moscow.

Carter's drive may keep U.S. out of Moscow Games

It had been launched as a trial balloon—and it took off almost immediately. By week's end the White House campaign had gathered so much momentum that there may be no American athletes competing for Olympic medals in Moscow this summer.

As the Administration gradually increased the pressure for a boycott in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, alarmed officials of the U.S. Olympic Committee tried in vain to stop the campaign, pleading that sports should not be used to promote political ends. But Carter, appearing on Meet the Press at the beginning of the week, put his full prestige behind the policy. Said he: "Regardless of what other nations might do, I would not favor sending an American Olympic team to Moscow while the Soviet invasion troops are in Afghanistan" (see box). He set a Feb. 20 deadline for Soviet withdrawal. In his State of the Union speech, he served the ultimatum again. Meanwhile, White House aides were trying, none too subtly, to win over American Olympic officials. Yes, the aides agreed, the committee has final authority on whether to join the Moscow Games. Yes, in theory the committee was independent of the Government. But, Carter's assistants suggested, the President could ask Congress to change all that. For one thing, the committee is incorporated under a federal charter granted by Congress, and Congress could amend the charter to forbid participation in Moscow. For another, \$16 million in federal funds has been appropriated this year to cover some of the committee's operating expenses, and none of it has yet been paid.

Congress, moreover, quickly took up the crusade against the Games. Without White House prompting, four resolutions endorsing a Moscow boycott were introduced on the Hill. By the time the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on one such resolution, the Olympic committee was thoroughly on the defensive. The president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, Robert J. Kane, a former sprinter at Cornell and longtime athletic director at the university, found little support as he testified against the ban. "We do have a problem to face if we're out there alone, swaying in the wind," he argued. "If we are the only nation not to appear in the Games, what good would this do?" Asked about the 1936 Olympics, which had been cited as a propaganda triumph for Adolf Hitler that Soviet leaders are now seeking to emulate, Kane objected to such "rewritten history" and contended: "Jesse Owen destroyed the myth of Aryan supremacy in 1936. It was a propaganda victory for our wonderful black athletes in the United States."

Kane's plea proved futile. The House committee promptly approved the resolution by voice vote, and next day it went sailing through the full House by a vote of 386 to 12. The Senate seemed certain to add its assent.

“Resounding Chorus of Maybes” *Time* March 31, 1980, 68.

Monday, Mar. 31, 1980

## Sport: A Resounding Chorus of Maybes (Part 2)

Among U.S. athletes, the dominant sentiment seemed to be against a boycott, but the debate was spirited. Protested Steve Lundquist, 19, a swimmer from Southern Methodist University: "You look forward to this all your life. Suddenly they just pull it out from under you." At first Al Oerter, 43, a four-time gold medal winner in the discus, complained that U.S. withdrawal from the Games was "passive, isolationist, weak." But like many other athletes he had changed his mind by last week. Said he: "I feel we should stop bellyaching and get behind the President. It is time to put personal considerations aside."

The 47-member Athletes' Advisory Council, which serves the U.S. Olympic Committee, conducted its own poll on the boycott. Of the 42 athletes who expressed an opinion, 30 opposed a ban. The findings were given to the 82-member executive board of the U.S.O.C., which was meeting in Colorado Springs.

After closed-door deliberations in the Broadmoor hotel, the Olympic elders indicated on Saturday that they would go along with the President's call for a boycott. The board passed a resolution proposing that the Summer Games be transferred away from Moscow or canceled.

Would the U.S. be as lonely in its boycott as the Olympic committee had predicted? Carter personally asked some 100 foreign leaders to abandon the Moscow Games, and their responses were extremely slow in coming. The early returns were also discouraging. Even in Great Britain, where Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's government strongly supports the U.S. position, the independent British Olympic Association remained adamantly opposed to a boycott. "The Games will be held in Moscow no matter what governments say," contended Lord Exeter, 74, the sixth Marquess of Exeter, and a 1928 gold medal winner in hurdles. "We are not lap dogs to politics."

One other foreign leader speaking for the boycott was Canada's Prime Minister Joe Clark, but he faces a stiff reelection challenge from former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's Liberal Party, and Trudeau has been cool to a ban. Mexico has already announced its intention to field a squad in Moscow.

The U.S. did pick up the support of Egypt, Australia, New Zealand and The Netherlands, plus such nonathletic powers as Fiji, Qatar, Djibouti and Saudi Arabia (which had decided not to send a team even before the Afghanistan invasion).

A key nation for the boycott movement is West Germany, which normally would enter a strong team in Moscow. Bonn officials clearly would like their athletes to compete but were nervously watching world reaction to Carter's drive. Having criticized Carter so long for not dealing more sternly with the Kremlin, they found it uncomfortable to oppose his tough stance now.

Elsewhere in Europe, the U.S. was getting little help. France said it would compete. Italy's Olympic committee insisted that only a veto by the government could prevent its participation, and none was in the works. All the Scandinavian nations seemed determined to enter.

As the worldwide debate continued, any formal action either to abandon this year's Games completely or move them from Moscow would have to be taken by the International Olympic Committee, and its position was clear: plans could not, and should not, be changed; on to Moscow.

Despite Carter's opposition to attending their Games, the Soviets still intend to compete in the Winter Olympics in Lake Placid in February, and other athletic competition between the two countries continued. Last week American wrestling and boxing teams were taking part in long-scheduled matches in the Soviet Union, while a Soviet track-and-field team began a tour of the U.S.

The slim possibility remained that some kind of alternative to the Moscow Games might be staged elsewhere, either as a more limited "free world" competition or as an additional post-Moscow event. Presidential aides indicated that Carter would be willing to seek U.S. financing for such competition. As an alternative site, Canada's Clark offered Montreal, where the 1976 Olympic Games were held, although housing the athletes would be a problem.

Inevitably, and understandably, many of the U.S. athletes who had trained for so long were bitterly disappointed that they might have to forgo the chance to compete in Moscow. But there was growing agreement in the U.S. with Jimmy Carter's declaration that for this Olympics, under these conditions, there were "deeper issues at stake."